

REMARKS

Reconsideration is again respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-8, and 10-20 under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over Gueneau et al in view of Weimar.

Applicant respectfully points out that the Gueneau reference teaches that the portion 3a denominated in the office action as the “web” is made of a relatively compliant material. See, column 6, at lines 38, 39. The claims, however, recite a clip of “rigid thermoplastic material.” Thus, Gueneau as applied in the office action fails to describe more than just the reinforcement element.

Moreover, Weimar clearly fails to provide the person of ordinary skill in the art any reason to employ a reinforcement element 20 in the Figure 8 structure of Gueneau reproduced in the office action.

Further, even if such a reinforcement element were provided, for purposes of argument only, it appears that the invention as claimed would not result.

Accordingly, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and an early indication thereof is respectfully requested.

All necessary extensions of time are hereby requested. Please charge any deficiency and credit any excess to deposit account 50-1088.

Respectfully submitted,
CLARK & BRODY

/Conrad J. Clark/

Conrad J. Clark
Reg. No. 30,340

Suite 510
1700 Diagonal Road
Alexandria, VA 22314
(202) 835-1754
February 2, 2011